REMARKS

Claims 1-10 were pending in the application at the time the present Office Action was mailed. To improve readability, clarify aspects of the applicants' technology, and fix typographical errors, the applicants have cancelled claims 1-10 and added new claims 11-28. Accordingly, claims 11-28 are pending.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,297,819 ("Furst"), either in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,246 ("Begley"), or in view of Begley and in further view of the Office Action's official notice.

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the Office Action, and respond to the rejections as follows.

The applicants' technology converts to a preferred language supplemental content using a language pack downloaded from the server. The conversion occurs at a client by downloading a language pack corresponding to an application, searching in the language pack for localized strings corresponding to indications in the supplemental content of localizable strings, and using the localized strings. The downloaded language pack contains localized strings and unique identifiers associated with the localized strings. Localized strings are strings that have been translated into a particular language (e.g., French), and may be represented statically in the language pack. The conversion process detects localizable strings in supplemental content, e.g., by searching for identifiers, and searches for the associated identifier in the language pack to retrieve the localized string. The localized string of the language pack is then used with the supplemental content to create a localized version of the supplemental content. As indicated above, localization of the supplemental content occurs at the client.

Supplemental content may be used, e.g., in a popup menu. As an example, at a web site for an online grocer, a user may indicate a preference for vegetables by selecting an option. In response, a script or object on the client may display a list of available vegetables. This list of vegetables may be represented as supplemental

content, e.g., using a set of identifiers, such as 101 and 102. The downloaded language pack may comprise the identifiers 101 and 102, and strings associated with the identifiers, such as "broccoli" and "spinach." A script or object on the client may then match the 101 and 102 of the supplemental content with "broccoli" or "spinach" of the language pack (e.g., in French or any indicated preferred language) when providing the popup menu of vegetables to the user.

In stark contrast to the applicants' technology, Furst is directed to a system for a browser-aware application delivery system. (Furst, Abstract.) The system provides a browser with "extensions based on server processes rather than plug-in program modules loaded and installed on [the client]." (Emphasis added.) (Furst, Abstract.) Furst further provides a translation application tool as an example of such a server process. (Furst, 11:65-12:5.) This example indicates that a web page is transmitted "to a translation server, which produces a results web page that is sent to a client tool window for display." (Furst, 12:1-3.) Thus, in Furst's system, content is dynamically translated by an automated server process.

There are several notable differences between the applicants' technology and Furst's technique, only two of which are discussed below. First, the applicants' technology converts supplemental content at the client. The applicant is unable to find any teaching or suggestion in Furst that any content, much less supplemental content, may be translated at the client. An advantage of converting supplemental content at the client is that the supplemental content does not need to be retransmitted to the server, perhaps translated at a busy server (which could take some time), and re-downloaded to the client after translation. Thus, the applicants' technique would save time required to exchange the supplemental content between the client and the server and translate the supplemental content at the server. Furthermore, the applicants' technology may cause all translated supplemental content contained in a language pack to be downloaded to the client prior to conversion. In contrast, Furst's technique does not translate content until the client sends the content to the translation server.

A second notable point of departure from Furst's technique is that the applicants' technology searches for and replaces strings in supplemental content of a server-based

application that has been downloaded to a client. Thus, static strings contained in a language pack may be used to provide the supplemental content at the client. These strings could have been optimally translated for the application. As an example, technical terms used in the application can be accurately translated and provided in language packs in a variety of languages. In contrast, Furst's translation technique has no apparent association to the web content that it translates. Because Furst's technique uses a translation server that translates any content without regard as to the applicability or relevance of the translated words, the applicants' technology would produce superior results in a variety of contexts.

The applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in the remaining applied references that overcome these deficiencies in Furst. The new claims recite the feature of localizing the localizable strings of supplemental content at a client using localized strings of a language pack downloaded from a server. Accordingly, the applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable over the applied references.

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably define over the applied art. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6478.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: Sep 3, 2004

Rajiv Sarathy
Registration No. 55,592

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000